

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious over Chemel et al. (hereinafter 'Chemel') in view of Khemakhem et al (hereinafter Khemakhem). This contention is respectfully traversed, and for reasons set forth herein, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Chemel shows a system which includes a number of LEDs, as well as memory and processors in its figure 1. Figure 1 also shows two different kinds of communication, 120 and 122, as well as a power supply. Chemel discusses the power supply in paragraph 155.

The output from the unit 100 is sent to the light system, but Chemel's specification provides no teaching or suggestion of how this is done.

Claim 1 defines that both the signal and power are put on the same connectors. Claim 1 requires that there are signals for plural separate lighting fixtures, and also power signals on the same connector. Chemel's figure 1 does show a connection between the processor and power supply and LED assembly. However, Chemel has no disclosure of a single connector carrying

both power and signal to the LED assemblies. The contention in the official action that the "connectors connected with the LED 104, figure 1" is in fact a signal and power carrying connector is based on hindsight, not on the teaching of the Chemel prior art. In fact, there is no teaching or suggestion of this claimed feature.

Moreover, the specific mechanical layout of this system is also important, advantageous, and not shown by Chemel, as admitted by the rejection. The rejection states that Khemakhem's subject matter would render obvious the use of these connectors on different opposite sides of the housing. This contention is respectfully traversed. In fact, Khemakhem is a signal transformer. Khemakhem's Figure 5 shows connectors 34; presumably BNC connectors. This would be on one of the outer walls. The other outer wall, however, presumably shows wires that are simply attached to terminal blocks 22.

Column 4 lines 25-36 suggests XLR connectors.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Khemakhem of putting power and signal over one set of connectors on one side of the box, and signal only, over the other set of connectors on the other side of the box.

Moreover, even if the pieces of this claimed subject matter could be found in the hypothetical combination, there is certainly no teaching or suggestion of the overall claimed

subject matter. Claim 1 requires receiving plural signal carrying connectors on one outer wall, and producing signal and power carrying connectors on the other outer wall. In this way, there is a separation between the signal connectors on one wall, and the signal and power connectors on the other wall. This facilitates connections, since like-type connectors make up the contents of a wall. Nothing in the cited prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

Claim 6 defines installing a plurality of lights with a permanently installed power supply, and powering each of these lights using a portable power supply. Claim 6 also defines providing control signals for the plurality of lights using the same portable power supply. The rejection alleges that Claims 6-8 "would necessarily perform the recited method steps". However, this is respectfully suggested to be incorrect, since there is not one word in the cited prior art references about the subject matter of using lights which are "intended for permanent installation with a permanently installed power supply" to instead use a portable power supply. There is no teaching or suggestion of the power and control signals that are formed using the same portable power supply. There is no teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of Claim 8 that there are different types of connectors for power and signal, than for just signal.

Therefore, Claims 6-8 should be additionally allowable for this reason.

Claim 9 defines the specific pin numbers of the connector. The rejection alleges that "the specific number of pins of the connectors would have been an obvious design consideration". However, this contention is respectfully traversed, since Claim 9 defines a specific way of dealing with a specific problem which is encountered by this system, and presumably would not be encountered by the prior art. Specifically, this system must receive control signals, and output over connectors that include not only those control signals, but also power. Claim 9 recognizes the advantages of using a system which has some easy way of distinguishing between the connectors which are signal-only, and the connectors which are signal plus power. According to Claim 9, the five pin connectors are used for receiving control signals and the four pin connectors are used for outputting control plus power. This makes it easy to distinguish between those connectors that are signal only, and those connectors which are signal plus power. Moreover, it makes it very difficult for someone to accidentally plug the wrong connector into the wrong jack. Therefore, Claim 9 should be allowable for these reasons.

The specific dependent claims not specifically mentioned herein should be allowable for reasons stated above with respect to the respective independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. No fee is believed to be due, however please apply any credits or additional charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 12, 2007

/Scott C Harris/
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10716689.doc